1 2	ROB BONTA Attorney General of California MATTHEW M. DAVIS	
	Supervising Deputy Attorney General	
3	TESSA L. HEUNIS Deputy Attorney General	
4	State Bar No. 241559 600 West Broadway, Suite 1800	
5	San Diego, CA 92101 P.O. Box 85266	
6	San Diego, CA 92186-5266 Telephone: (619) 738-9403	
7	Facsimile: (619) 645-2061	
8	Attorneys for Complainant	
9		
10	BEFORE THE MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA	
11	DEPARTMENT OF CO STATE OF C	ONSUMER AFFAIRS
12	· STATE OF C.	I
13	In the Matter of the First Amended Accusation Against:	Case No. 800-2018-049560
14	VICTOR V. LONG, M.D.	
15	Kaiser Riverside Med Center 10800 Magnolia Ave., MOB # 2, Fl. 3	FIRST AMENDED ACCUSATION
16	Riverside, CA 92505	
17	Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. A 119226,	·
18	110. A 11/220,	ı.
19	Respondent.	
20		J
21	<u>PARTIES</u>	
22	William Prasifka (Complainant) bring	s this First Amended Accusation solely in his
23	official capacity as the Executive Director of the Medical Board of California, Department of	
24	Consumer Affairs (Board).	
25	2. On or about December 2, 2011, the B	oard issued Physician's and Surgeon's
26	Certificate Number A 119226 to Victor V. Long, M.D. (Respondent). The Physician's and	
27	Surgeon's Certificate was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought	
28	herein and will expire on October 31, 2023, unless renewed.	
	1	

10

11 12

13

1415

16

17

18 19

20

21

2223

24

25

////

////

26

2728

JURISDICTION

- 3. This First Amended Accusation, which supersedes Accusation No. 800-2018-049560 filed on July 9, 2021, ¹ is brought before the Board under the authority of the following laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code (Code) unless otherwise indicated.
 - 4. Section 2004 of the Code states:

The board shall have the responsibility for the following:

- (a) The enforcement of the disciplinary ... provisions of the Medical Practice Act.
 - (b) The administration and hearing of disciplinary actions.
- (c) Carrying out disciplinary actions appropriate to findings made by a panel or an administrative law judge.
- (d) Suspending, revoking, or otherwise limiting certificates after the conclusion of disciplinary actions.
- 5. Section 2220 of the Code states:

Except as otherwise provided by law, the board may take action against all persons guilty of violating this chapter. The board shall enforce and administer this article as to physician and surgeon certificate holders, including those who hold certificates that do not permit them to practice medicine, such as, but not limited to, retired, inactive, or disabled status certificate holders, and the board shall have all the powers granted in this chapter for these purposes including, but not limited to:

- (a) Investigating complaints from the public, from other licensees, from health care facilities, or from the board that a physician and surgeon may be guilty of unprofessional conduct. ...
- (b) Investigating the circumstances of practice of any physician and surgeon where there have been any judgments, settlements, or arbitration awards requiring the physician and surgeon or his or her professional liability insurer to pay an amount in damages in excess of a cumulative total of thirty thousand dollars (\$30,000) with respect to any claim that injury or damage was proximately caused by the physician's and surgeon's error, negligence, or omission.

¹ This First Amended Accusation is filed for the sole purpose of including the text and import of Business and Professions Code section 125.3, as amended by Stats.2021, c. 649 (S.B.806), § 1, eff. Jan. 1, 2022.

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

- Section 2227 of the Code states:
- (a) A licensee whose matter has been heard by an administrative law judge of the Medical Quality Hearing Panel as designated in Section 11371 of the Government Code, or whose default has been entered, and who is found guilty, or who has entered into a stipulation for disciplinary action with the board, may, in accordance with the provisions of this chapter:
 - (1) Have his or her license revoked upon order of the board.
- (2) Have his or her right to practice suspended for a period not to exceed one year upon order of the board.
- (3) Be placed on probation and be required to pay the costs of probation monitoring upon order of the board.
- (4) Be publicly reprimanded by the board. The public reprimand may include a requirement that the licensee complete relevant educational courses approved by the
- (5) Have any other action taken in relation to discipline as part of an order of probation, as the board or an administrative law judge may deem proper.
- Section 2234 of the Code, states:

The board shall take action against any licensee who is charged with unprofessional conduct. In addition to other provisions of this article, unprofessional conduct includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- (a) Violating or attempting to violate, directly or indirectly, assisting in or abetting the violation of, or conspiring to violate any provision of this chapter.

 - (c) Repeated negligent acts. To be repeated, there must be two or more
- negligent acts or omissions. An initial negligent act or omission followed by a separate and distinct departure from the applicable standard of care shall constitute
- (1) An initial negligent diagnosis followed by an act or omission medically appropriate for that negligent diagnosis of the patient shall constitute a single
- (2) When the standard of care requires a change in the diagnosis, act, or omission that constitutes the negligent act described in paragraph (1), including, but not limited to, a reevaluation of the diagnosis or a change in treatment, and the licensee's conduct departs from the applicable standard of care, each departure constitutes a separate and distinct breach of the standard of care.

COST RECOVERY

8. Section 125.3 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that the Board may request the administrative law judge to direct a licensee found to have committed a violation or violations of the licensing act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of the case, with failure of the licensee to comply subjecting the license to not being renewed or reinstated. If a case settles, recovery of investigation and enforcement costs may be included in a stipulated settlement.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 9. Patient² was a thirty-six (36) year-old G3P2³ female with two previous vaginal deliveries. Her expected date of delivery was June 26, 2017.
- 10. Patient began having early labor symptoms on July 2, 2017. She was evaluated at the hospital and ultimately sent home with labor precautions after fetal heart rate (FHR) monitoring showed a reassuring tracing.⁴
- 11. Patient returned to hospital on July 3, 2017, at 41 weeks gestational age and was initially seen around 3:48 a.m. with a chief complaint of a rupture of membranes and mild uterine contractions. Upon entry to Labor and Delivery, external FHR monitoring showed variable decelerations⁵ which prompted oxygen by nasal cannula and repositioning by the primary Registered Nurse (RN) at 4:04 a.m.

² The identity of the patient is known to all parties but not disclosed to protect her privacy.

³ Third pregnancy, two prior deliveries.

⁴ Fetal heart rate patterns are classified as reassuring, nonreassuring or ominous. Nonreassuring patterns (such as fetal tachycardia, bradycardia and late decelerations with good short-term variability) require intervention to rule out fetal acidosis. Ominous patterns require emergency intrauterine fetal resuscitation and immediate delivery. A Category I tracing is normal. A Category II tracing is indeterminate and requires continued surveillance and reevaluation. A Category III tracing is abnormal and predictive of abnormal fetal-acid base status at the time of observation. Depending on the clinical situation, efforts to expeditiously resolve the underlying cause of the abnormal fetal heart rate pattern should be made.

⁵ Variations in fetal heart rate patterns are termed accelerations or decelerations as the heart rate changes from the baseline fetal heart rate. Variable decelerations happen when the baby's umbilical cord is temporarily compressed. The baby depends on steady blood flow through the umbilical cord to receive oxygen and other important nutrients. Variable

- 12. Noting minimal variability and variable decelerations at 4:15 a.m., the FHR strip was shown to Respondent (who was the obstetrician on duty) at approximately 4:17 a.m.
- 13. Respondent saw Patient for the first time at about 4:45 a.m. and reviewed the FHR strip. He was made aware of moderate variability and decelerations. Respondent did not give any orders and admitted Patient at about 5:10 a.m.
 - 14. Respondent did a bedside ultrasound at about 5:13 a.m.
- 15. At about 5:20 a.m., Respondent placed an internal fetal scalp electrode and an internal pressure catheter for amnioinfusion in an attempt to relieve variable decelerations. A sterile vaginal exam showed 1.5 cm dilation,⁶ 90% effaced,⁷ negative 2 station⁸ (notated as 1.5/90/-2).
- 16. A note in Patient's chart by Respondent at 5:50 a.m. states moderate variability, accelerations, and resolution of deep variable decelerations with amnioinfusion. He notes a Category 2 tracing.
- 17. At 6:25 a.m., Respondent reviewed the FHR strip. Nursing notes confirmed minimal to moderate variability with variable decelerations and late decelerations. A nurse's note at 6:31 a.m. documents Respondent discussing a possible cesarean section with Patient and ordering Pitocin augmentation⁹ with epidural anesthesia.

//// ////

decelerations may be classified according to their depth and duration as: mild, when the depth is above 80 bpm and the duration is less than 30 seconds; moderate, when the depth is between 70 and 80 bpm and the duration is between 30 and 60 seconds; and severe, when the depth is below 70 bpm and the duration is longer than 60 seconds. Variable decelerations are generally associated with a favorable outcome. However, a persistent variable deceleration pattern, if not corrected, may lead to acidosis and fetal distress and therefore is nonreassuring. Nonreassuring variable decelerations associated with the loss of beat-to-beat variability correlate substantially with fetal acidosis and therefore represent an ominous pattern.

⁶ Dilation is the term used to describe the opening or widening of the cervix. This is measured from 0 to 10 centimeters, the latter of which means the cervix is fully dilated.

⁷ To be 90 percent effaced means that the cervix has thinned out 90 percent of the way to maximum effacement, which is called 100 percent effacement.

⁸ Station is the position of baby's head as it relates to the ischial spines (bony spots on each side of the pelvis). It is measured on a scale of -5 (head floating above the pelvis) to +5 (head crowning at the vagina's opening).

⁹ Pitocin is the synthetic form of oxytocin, the body's natural hormone that stimulates contractions. It is one of the most frequently used medical interventions to induce or augment (speed up) birth.

	18.	Pitocin is meant to increase the strength and frequency of uterine contractions, one of
the m	ost st	ressful events to a fetus in labor. Respondent ordered Pitocin when Patient's fetus wa
alrea	dy in j	eopardy.

- 19. According to Patient's chart, by 7:09 a.m. respondent was again discussing with Patient the possibility of a cesarean section for a persistent Category II tracing. The cervix at that time was 3/90/-2. A nurse's note describes late and variable decelerations at 7:30 a.m. Nurses document "to start Pitocin as ordered with current FHR pattern."
- 20. The initiation of Pitocin augmentation was delayed by anesthetic and pain issues for more than an hour, and began infusing at 7:57 a.m. Around 8:00 a.m., nursing notes document worrisome late decelerations, continued repetitive variable decelerations, and minimal variability. The internal pressure catheter was not working properly.
- 21. The fetal intolerance of labor continued to worsen with the FHR tracing reaching a Category 3, shown by repetitive late decelerations along with absent variability. At 8:17 a.m., Pitocin was discontinued and Patient signed a consent for cesarean section.
- 22. A midwife's note in Patient's chart at 8:19 a.m. documents absent variability and recurrent variable decelerations.
- 23. In short, the FHR monitoring was never reassuring. Patient's contraction pattern was irregular, of low amplitude, and Patient made no significant progress, never achieving the active phase of labor.
- 24. Patient was taken to the operating room by 8:26 a.m. A fetal heart rate of 125 beats per minute (bpm) was detected at 8:36 a.m. Documentation in Patient's chart shows no evidence of an urgent or emergent response. The cesarean section incision began at 8:42 a.m.
- 25. Baby was delivered by cesarean section at 8:48 a.m. with an Apgar score¹⁰ of 0 at one minute, 0 at five minutes and 0 at 10 minutes. After unsuccessful resuscitation efforts, Baby was pronounced dead at 12:03 p.m.

26 || ////

¹⁰ Apgar stands for "Appearance, Pulse, Grimace, Activity, and Respiration." The Apgar score is based on a total score of 1 to 10. The higher the score, the better the baby is doing after birth. A score of 7, 8, or 9 is normal and is a sign that the newborn is in good health.

[
1	26. Pathology on the placenta showed dark green meconium staining of the	
2	membranes.	
3	FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE	
4	(Gross Negligence)	
5	27. Respondent Victor V. Long, M.D. is subject to disciplinary action under sections	
6	2227 and 2234, as defined by section 2234, subdivision (b), of the Code, in that he committed	
7	gross negligence in his care and treatment of Patient, including, but not limited to, the following:	
8	(a) By ordering, and subsequently confirming his order, to begin Pitocin augmentation in	
9	the face of a nonreassuring FHR tracing.	
.0	(b) By failing to initiate an emergency cesarean section by 8:08 a.m. in the face of fetal	
.1	distress, as evidenced by a Category III tracing while on Pitocin augmentation.	
.2	SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE	
3	(Repeated Negligent Acts)	
4	28. Respondent Victor V. Long, M.D. is further subject to disciplinary action under	
.5	sections 2227 and 2234, as defined by section 2234, subdivision (c), of the Code, in that he	
.6	committed repeated negligent acts in his care and treatment of Patient, including, but not limited	
7	to, the following:	
.8	(a) By failing to initiate a cesarean section by 7:00 a.m., when Patient had had more than	
.9	three hours of a Category II nonreassuring tracing, no evidence of active labor, and minimal	
20	variability.	
21	(b) By ordering, and subsequently confirming his order, to begin Pitocin augmentation in	
22	the face of a nonreassuring FHR tracing.	
23	(c) By failing to initiate an emergency cesarean section by 8:08 a.m. in the face of fetal	
24	distress, as evidenced by a Category III tracing while on Pitocin augmentation.	
25	1111	
26	1111	
27	-	
28		
ļ	II	

(Incompetence)

29. Respondent Victor V. Long, M.D. is further subject to disciplinary action under sections 2227 and 2234, as defined by section 2234, subdivision (d), of the Code, in that he demonstrated incompetence in his care and treatment of Patient in that he ordered, and subsequently confirmed his order, to begin Pitocin augmentation in the face of a nonreassuring FHR tracing.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged, and that following the hearing, the Medical Board of California issue a decision:

- Revoking or suspending Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate Number A 119226, issued to Respondent Victor V. Long, M.D.;
- 2. Revoking, suspending or denying approval of Respondent Victor V. Long, M.D.'s authority to supervise physician assistants and advanced practice nurses;
- 3. Ordering Respondent Victor V. Long, M.D., if placed on probation, to pay the Board the costs of probation monitoring;
- 4. Ordering Respondent Victor V. Long, M.D., to pay the Board the reasonable costs of the enforcement of this case incurred on or after January 1, 2022, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 125.3; and
 - 5. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.

JAN 19 2022 DATED:

Medical Board of California

Department of Consumer Affairs

State of California Complainant

27

28